

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

**STATUS REPORT PURSUANT TO
FEDERAL RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE RULE 26(f)**

Pursuant to the Court's prior order of February 1, 2023 (ECG DKT. #33) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f), counsel for the Plaintiffs, Steven Glink, respectfully submits this status report primarily to update the Court on the status of the defendant Vidmar's pending criminal cases:

I. NATURE OF THE CASE

A. JURISDICTION

The Court had jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1331 and venue pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1332, as Plaintiffs' claims were based on federal questions against governmental defendants. , to wit, violations of Title IX and the alleged denial of plaintiff's rights to due process and equal protection via 42 USC 1983, et al. The school defendants filed a Rule 12 (B) (6) motion to dismiss. The Court granted that motion on June 7, 2021 (ECF DKT. # 17). The Court has retained the case under the doctrine of supplemental jurisdiction over pendant state claims.

B. Nature of Complaint

Plaintiff alleged that defendant Vidmar, while employed by the board of education for Beecher CUSD # 201U as a music/ band teacher set up video cameras in a room where he then directed students, including Carla, to change from civilian clothes to band uniforms. It is alleged that Vidmar recorded plaintiff and other students in a state of (at least) partial nudity without their knowledge or consent.

Vidmar has felony and a misdemeanor cases pending in Will County. Those cases are set for trial on August 7, 2023.

C. RELIEF SOUGHT

Plaintiffs are seeking money damages in the amount of \$200,000.

D. JURY STATUS: There is no current jury demand

E. STATUS OF SERVICE:

Defendant Vidmar is represented by counsel after he waived service.

II. PENDING MOTIONS AND CASE PLAN

- A. The Court has stayed these proceedings until the underlying criminal cases are resolved.
- B. Plaintiff's counsel has received a voice message from Will County State's Attorney Katie Revenda. Her message was that Vidmar's criminal case will proceed to a jury trial "sometime over the summer: as there are a number of "victims who are out of the country" until then.
- C. Subject to the Court's direction and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b), plaintiff's counsel request that the schedule of pretrial discovery and trial dates be deferred until the status of Vidmar's criminal cases are resolved.

Deadline for Rule 26(a)(1) disclosures	Deferred
Deadline to issue written discovery	Deferred

Completion of all discovery	Deferred
Pre-close of discovery status hearing	Deferred
Plaintiff's disclosure of expert witnesses	Deferred
Defendants' disclosure of expert witnesses	Deferred
Close of discovery status hearing	Deferred
Deadline for filing summary judgment motions	Deferred
Deadline for response to summary judgment	Deferred
Deadline for reply to summary judgment	Deferred
Exchange motions in limine, exhibit and witness list(s)	Deferred
Ruling on summary judgment motions	Deferred to the Court's discretion
Deadline for Proposed Final Pretrial Order	Deferred
Deadline for responses to motions in limine	Deferred
Final Pretrial Conference	Deferred
Trial	TBD by the Court

III. SETTLEMENT and REFERRALS

- A. This is a “no offer” case.
- B. The parties respectfully decline to have a magistrate preside over this matter.
- C. The parties request that the current in-person status date of April 27, 2023 be rescheduled to a date in September. The attorney for the remaining defendant James Vidmar has no objection to the representations herein.

Dated: April 11, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

By: s/ Steven Glink

/s/ Steven E. Glink

Attorney for plaintiffs

Law Office of Steven Glink, #6180869
Attorney for Plaintiffs
PO Box 1053
Northbrook, Illinois 60062
847-480-7749 (voice)
Email: steve@educationrights.com